

Application No. 09/974,876
Amendment Dated June 17 2004
Response to Office Action of March 17, 2004

REMARKS

Applicant is most appreciative of the thorough consideration that the Examiner has accorded this patent application.

Claims 1-9 remain in this patent application. Of these, claims 2, 6 and 8, drawn to non-elected species, have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner.

Rejection of Claims - 35 USC § 103(a)

In the last Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 9 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent No. 5,069,262 (Nakasaki et al.) or, alternatively, European Patent Application 0 294 153 A1, in view of U.S. patent No. 3,373,066 (Hindin), U.S. patent No. 3,486,546 (Sidles et al.), U.S. patent No. 3,525,654 (Uotani et al.), U.S. patent No. 3,525,655 (Wood et al.), U.S. patent No. 3,756,883 (Gay), U.S. patent No. 3,916,969 (Auerbach et al.) and U.S. patent No. 3,901,751 (Wilson). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection insofar as it might be deemed applicable to claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 9, as now presented.

Without acquiescing in the rejection, Applicant has amended claim 1 to specify that the radial bias angle of the carcass reinforcing cords in the vulcanized tire changes progressively from 90° in the regions of the bead hoops to as low as 70° in the central crown region. The language added to claim 1 was most helpfully suggested by the Examiner in the last Office Action. The Examiner stated that, with the added language, "favorable consideration would be given to claim 1." Applicant agrees with the Examiner's assessment that "the prior art of record fails to suggest using the single stage technique to make radial tires wherein the radial bias angle of the carcass reinforcing cords in the vulcanized tire changes progressively from 90° in the regions of the bead hoops

Application No. 09/974,876
Amendment Dated June 17 2004
Response to Office Action of March 17, 2004

to as low as 70° in the central crown region." The prior art of record cannot, then, properly serve as a basis for rejecting claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 9, as now presented.

Applicant trusts that, with the amendments to claim 1 presented herein, the Examiner will find this claim to be allowable. Also, since claim 1 is generic to all of the species identified by the Examiner in the Office Action dated October 6, 2003, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 2, 6 and 8 no longer be held as withdrawn.

The allowability of independent claim 1 inheres, of course, in claims 2-9 that depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. The dependent claims are, moreover, allowable by virtue of additional patentable limitations that they recite.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks presented herein, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection stated in the last Office Action and recognize claims 1-9, all of the claims now pending in this application, as allowable.

The Examiner is invited to contact Frederick R. Handren, Reg. No. 32,874, at (703) 205-8066 in the Washington, DC area if a discussion with Applicant's representative would be helpful for resolving any issues remaining in this application.

Application No. 09/974,876
Amendment Dated June 17 2004
Response to Office Action of March 17, 2004

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge any payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448. This authorization applies to any additional fees required under 37 CFR §1.16 and 37 CFR §1.17 and in particular to fees for an extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By *Andrew D. Meikle Reg. No. 32828*
for Andrew D. Meikle
Reg. No. 32,868

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

2155-0111P